

VOLUME 1. Part 9. Pp. 193-224.

28th FEBRUARY 1947

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission

On the relative status of the names *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea). By H. Vogel, *Institut für Schiffs- und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg* . p. 193

On the status of the generic name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) in relation to *Opinion 77*. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* . p. 195

On the relative merits of the names DISSOTREMATIDAE, GYLIAUCHENIDAE, and OPISTHOLEBETIDAE as the name of the family containing the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea). By H. W. Manter, *Department of Zoology and Anatomy, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska* . p. 197

On the date as from which the names published in Pallas (P. S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica* are available nomenclatorially. By the late W. L. Slater, M.A., with an Annex by the late C. D. Sherborn, D.Sc. p. 198

(continued on back wrapper)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature

and

Sold on their behalf by the International Trust for Zoological
Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1947

Price five shillings and seven pence

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION

A. The Officers of the Commission

President : Dr. Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (United Kingdom).

Vice-President : Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.).

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (United Kingdom).

B. The Members of the Commission

Class 1949

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (Argentina).

Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom) (*Secretary to the Commission*).

Dr. Karl JORDAN (United Kingdom) (*President of the Commission*).

Dr. Theodor MORTENSEN (Denmark).

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia).

Herr Professor Dr. Rudolf RICHTER (Germany).

Class 1952

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil).

Professor James Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.).

Professor Ludovico di CAPORIACCO (Italy).

Professor J. R. DYMOND (Canada).

Dr. James L. PETERS (U.S.A.) (*Vice-President of the Commission*).

Dr. Harold E. VOKES (U.S.A.).

Class 1955

Professor Dr. Hilbrand BOSCHMA (Netherlands).

Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (United Kingdom).

Professor Teiso ESAKI (Japan).

Professor Béla von HANKÓ (Hungary).

Dr. T. JACZEWSKI (Poland).

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.).

C. The Staff of the Secretariat in London

Secretary to the Commission : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Address of the Commission

Secretariat of the Commission:

British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S.W. 7.

Personal address of the Secretary:

83, Fellows Road (Garden Flat), London, N.W. 3.

E. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

The Officers of the Trust:

Chairman: Colonel Right Hon. Walter Elliot, M.C., M.P., F.R.S.

Managing Director and Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Registrar: Mr. A. S. Pankhurst.

The address of the Trust and its Publications Office:

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7.

ON THE RELATIVE STATUS OF THE NAMES *BILHARZIA* MECKEL VON HEMSBAACH, 1856, AND *SCHISTOSOMA* WEINLAND, 1858 (CLASS TREMATODA, ORDER DIGenea)

By H. VOGEL.

(Institut für Schiffs- und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg.)

(translation from the German original)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)138.)

Has the generic name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856 (originally spelt *Billharzia*, i.e. with a double "ll" through what is obviously a spelling mistake) or *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, validity under the International Code?

The original references to the above names are as follows :—

- (a) *Billharzia* (recte *Bilharzia*) Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, *Mikrogeologie* : 114 (Über die Concremente im thierischen Organismus von Heinrich Meckel von Hemsbach. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben von Dr. Th. Billroth, Berlin im Juli 1856). (Meckel died on 30th January 1856.)
- (b) *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, *Human Cest.* : 87.
- (c) *Bilharzia* Cobbold, 1859, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* 22 (4) : 363-366.

The type of each of the above genera is *Distomum haematobium* Bilharz, 1852, in Siebold, *Z. wiss. Zool.* 4 (1) : 59-62.

Meckel writes in his *Mikrogeologie* (: 114), published in July 1856 : "Bilharz beschrieb zuerst in v. Siebold und Kölliker's *Zeitschr. f. Zoologie*, 1852, einen neuen Eingeweidewurm des Menschen, sehr den Distomen ähnlich und deshalb von ihm *Distomum haematobium* genannt. Der Artnamen ist sehr bezeichnend, der Gattungsname darf nicht füglich *Distoma* bleiben, ist durch *Bilharzia* zu ersetzen. Dies Geschlecht weicht von allen bisher bekannten Arten von Trematoden ab durch getrenntes Geschlecht mit dem idealen Monogamie-Verhältnis, dass das Männchen sein kleines Weibchen mit sich trägt (im Canalis gynaeophorus)". On page 113 he talks about "Billharzien-Eiern" and on page 189 of "*Bilharzia haematobia* (*Distomum haem.*)".

The chief reason which induces me to stand for the introduction of the old name *Bilharzia* is to honour the memory of Th. M. Bilharz, and to give expression to the appreciation of his great merits. As is known, Bilharz not only discovered the parasite, but also connected it for the first time with the symptoms of the disease. Apart from this he was the discoverer of two other human parasites, *Hymenolepis nana* and *Heterophyes heterophyes*, and the students of natural science in his time were well acquainted with his name through his pioneer work on the electric organ of the "Zitterwels".¹ At the age of 37 Bilharz died of typhoid, while carrying out his researches. The name *Bilharzia*, which was formerly much in use, was gradually superseded by *Schistosoma* in the literature, as it was erroneously supposed that this name had the right of priority. In spite of this, the name *Bilharzia* is today still well known to all parasitologists and especially to doctors dealing with tropical diseases. Up to this day, the disease, when not called Schistosomiasis, is

¹ The species here referred to is the "Electric-Wels" or "Electric Catfish" of the Nile.

called either Bilharziosis or Bilharziasis. In the last (1935) edition of his widely read "Manual of Tropical Diseases", Manson-Bahr again used the old names *Bilharzia haematobia*, *B. mansoni* and *B. japonica*. If I support the re-introduction of the old name *Bilharzia*, this does not mean that scientific men would have to deal with a name very much out of use, having fallen into oblivion and then been dug up again.

The supersession of the old name *Bilharzia* has been regretted by many workers. As early as 1896 (*Mém. Inst. égypt.* 1896 : 158) Looss urged that the name *Bilharzia* should be retained in honour of its discoverer and he even went so far as to express the view that an exception to the Law of Priority would be justified in this case. (The existence of Meckel's prior *Bilharzia* of 1856 was obviously not known to Looss when he made these observations.) My teacher Fülleborn also frequently expressed in his lectures his regret that the name *Bilharzia* should have been displaced. In 1932 Leiper wrote : "Those, who regretted the displacement of the generic name *Bilharzia* Cobbold, 1859, by *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, under the Law of Priority will rejoice in the restoration of *Bilharzia* Meckel, 1856, under the same Law" (*Trop. Dis. Bull.* 29 : 168).

I am convinced that I am right in believing that students of natural science who support the retention of old-established names will welcome the restoration of the old name *Bilharzia* in its rightful place, which was once disputed as a consequence of an error as regards the question of priority. I desire, therefore, to ask the International Commission to be good enough to give this matter their renewed attention.

ON THE STATUS OF THE GENERIC NAME *SCHISTOSOMA* WEINLAND,
1858 (CLASS TREMATODA, ORDER DIGenea) IN RELATION TO
OPINION 77

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)138.)

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has the power (granted to it by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at Monaco in 1913) to place nomenclatorially available names (with their types) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. When such a name is placed on the *Official List*, that name and no other is the correct name for the genus in question and the type of the genus is the species indicated in the *Official List*.

2. Further, the International Commission has the power, also conferred upon it by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at Monaco in 1913, to suspend the rules in certain cases. When the International Commission uses the plenary powers so conferred upon it either to validate an otherwise invalid name or to designate as the type of a genus some species other than that which is the type under the International Code, the Commission has the power to place the name so validated and with the type so designated on the *Official List* and such action is final and not subject to revision.

3. The International Commission does not, however, possess—nor would it be reasonable that it should possess—the power to place on the *Official List* a name which is invalid under the Code, unless the Commission first uses its plenary powers to validate the name in question.

4. It follows, therefore, that, if it can be shown that, through a given case having been incompletely presented to the Commission or for some other cause, a nomenclatorially invalid name has been placed on the *Official List*, the decision of the Commission as respects that name is itself invalid, since it is *ultra vires* the powers of the Commission. In such a case, the *Opinion* (or portion of an *Opinion*) embodying the decision in question would remain as the record of the view of the Commission at the time that it was adopted but it would have no binding force.

5. The "statement of the case" submitted by Dr. Vogel in regard to *Bilharzia* (emendation of *Bilharzia*) Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, shows beyond possibility of dispute that the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, is no more than an objective synonym of *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, of which the same species (*Distomum haematobium* Bilharz, 1852) is the type. It follows, therefore, that, in placing the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 77, the International Commission committed an error of the kind discussed in paragraph 4 above and acted *ultra vires* their powers.

6. What happened, no doubt, was that at the time when the International Commission had this case under consideration in connection with *Opinion* 77, they were not aware of the existence of the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and believed that the name *Bilharzia* was first published by Cobbold in 1859. On these premises, the International Commission were correct in concluding that the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, was the oldest available generic name for *Distomum haematobium* Bilharz, 1852, and, therefore, that that name was eligible for inclusion in the *Official List*. As shown above,

BULL. Zool. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

the premises on which the International Commission reached this conclusion were, however, incorrect, because of the existence of the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, which has two years' priority over *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858. It should be noted, further, that the genus *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach is monotypical and was, therefore, published with an "indication" as defined in *Opinion 1*² and accordingly satisfies the requirements of proviso (a) to Article 25 of the International Code.

7. Clearly, it is essential that the above error should be rectified as soon as possible. It would be possible to do this in either of two ways:—

- (a) The International Commission could delete the invalid name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, from the *Official List* and could insert in its place the valid name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856;

or

- (b) The International Commission, if satisfied that the strict application of the rules as applied to the present case would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, could use their plenary powers (i) to suppress the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and (ii) to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, thereby giving retrospectively valid effect to the entry regarding the last-mentioned name in *Opinion 77*.

8. Specialists are, therefore, invited to inform the International Commission which, in their view, of the alternative courses indicated above is the one to be preferred.

² See 1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 1: 73–86.

ON THE RELATIVE MERITS OF THE NAMES DISSOTREMATIDAE, GYLIAUCHENIDAE, AND OPISTHOLEBETIDAE AS THE NAME OF THE FAMILY CONTAINING THE GENUS *DISSOTREMA* GOTO & MATSUDAIRA, 1918 (CLASS TREMATODA, ORDER DIGenea)

By H. W. MANTER.

(Department of Zoology and Anatomy, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)29.)

I would appreciate an *Opinion* on the following problem.

Goto and Matsudaira in 1918 (*J. Coll. Sci. Tokyo* 39 (Art. 8) : 1) named the trematode genus *Dissotrema* and considered it as type of the family DISSOTREMATIDAE. In 1919 (*J. Parasit.* 6 : 44-47), Goto recognised *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918, as a synonym of *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915, *Parasitology* 8 : 37. Although re-affirming the view that this genus justifies the new family, Goto did not rename the family which would, I believe, become GYLIAUCHENIDAE.

Poche (1925) lists the family DISSOTREMATIDAE with both genera (*Dissotrema* and *Gyliauchen*) either considering them as distinct or not aware of the synonymy. I cannot convince myself of generic differences between the two and feel that *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira must be considered a synonym of *Gyliauchen* Nicoll.

Fukui in 1928 (*Jap. J. Zool.* 2 : 336-339) considered *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, with its synonym *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, to be in the same family as *Opistholebes* Nicoll, 1915, *Parasitology* 8 : 36, and named a new family OPISTHOLEBETIDAE to accommodate them. It seems to me that he had no right to do this. He is actually changing the type genus from *Gyliauchen* to *Opistholebes*. I believe that the name of the family should be GYLIAUCHENIDAE or, if *Dissotrema* is valid, the name would be DISSOTREMATIDAE. Or does the fact that Goto did not change the name of the family when he changed the name of its type genus, make it possible for someone else to change the type of the family? That is the question involved. Would not GYLIAUCHENIDAE be a new name if implied but not actually expressed by Goto?

Supplementary Note on the literature of the case :—I enclose a brief synopsis of the situation to date, together with a statement of the problem as I see it :—

Dissotrema Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 : type of the family DISSOTREMATIDAE
Goto & Matsudaira, 1918.

Dissotrema Goto & Matsudaira, 1918, reduced to a synonym of *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915, by Goto in 1919; family name not mentioned by Goto.

Note :—Goto (1919) did state :—"That it [*Gyliauchen*] is sufficiently distinct . . . to justify the erection of a new family name has been pointed out".

Poche (1925) and Fuhrmann (1928), considering *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira and *Gyliauchen* Nicoll distinct, used the family name DISSOTREMATIDAE.

Fukui (1928) considered *Gyliauchen* Nicoll (and its synonym *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira) in the same family with *Opistholebes* Nicoll (hitherto unclassified) and named a new family (OPISTHOLEBETIDAE).

Osaki (1933), considering *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira a synonym of *Gyliauchen*,
BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

auchen Nicoll, referred it to the family "GYLIAUCHENIDAE (Goto & Matsudaira)", saying nothing about Fukui and the OPISTHOLEBETIDAE.

Yamaguti (1934) included *Gyliauchen* Nicoll and its synonym *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira in the family OPISTHOLEBETIDAE Fukui, 1928, thus accepting Fukui's type of a family which includes a genus which had already been indicated as a type of a family.

Travassos (1934), considering *Opistholebes* Nicoll and *Gyliauchen* Nicoll in different families and accepting OPISTHOLEBETIDAE, included *Gyliauchen* Nicoll in the family GYLIAUCHENIDAE Ozaki, 1933.

Problem: Considering *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918, a synonym of *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915 (thus ruling out the name DISSOTREMATIDAE) and considering *Opistholebes* Nicoll, 1915, and *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915, in the same family, is the correct name:—(i) OPISTHOLEBETIDAE Fukui, or (ii) GYLIAUCHENIDAE (Goto & Matsudaira), or (iii) GYLIAUCHENIDAE Ozaki, 1933?

**ON THE DATE AS FROM WHICH THE NAMES PUBLISHED IN PALLAS
(P. S.), ZOOGRAPHIA ROSSO-ASIATICA ARE AVAILABLE NOMEN-
CLATORIALY**

By the late W. L. SCLATER, M.A.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)25.)

The question of the date of publication of Pallas, *Zoographia rosso-asiatica* is one which has caused us a good deal of troubled discussion and I have been asked to inquire whether the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would take the matter up and give a decision.

The facts are well known and are given in some detail in a short paper in the *Ibis* 1934 : 164 by Dr. C. D. Sherborn, a copy of which is attached hereto (see Annex).

The question really resolves itself into what constitutes publication. Some copies of Pallas are dated "1811", and there can be no doubt that the book

was in the hands of some zoologists soon after that date, but owing to political troubles in Russia at that time and the Napoleonic invasion, the bulk of the edition was not issued till many years later. Most of the copies are dated "1831".

From the point of view of the nomenclature of our British birds the matter is of considerable importance, as a number of new names were introduced in the work which, if dated as from 1811, would be valid but, if dated as from 1827 or 1831, would be invalidated by other names introduced by authors whose work was published between 1811 and 1827.

ANNEX TO APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY MR. W. L. SCLATER ON THE DATES OF PALLAS'S *ZOOGRAPHIA ROSSO-ASIATICA*

By the late C. D. SHERBORN, D.Sc.

In order to clear away the numerous misunderstandings surrounding the dates of this work, my friend Mr. Norman Kinnear has asked me to codify and publish the notes made by me over a period of forty-five years.

Pallas's work consisted of three volumes. There were two issues, which differ slightly in the title-pages. Some of these copies are dated: Vol. 1. 1811; vol. 2. 1811; vol. 3. no date. Other copies, and these the most common, were dated: Vol. 1. 1831; vol. 2. 1831; vol. 3. 1831.

Of the former, I have known copies in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.), O. Salvin, A. Newton, G. M. Mathews, E. Eversmann, and other libraries. Of the latter numerous copies are known, and need not be detailed.

The work was known to many of the principal zoologists of Europe when it first appeared (see note to Cuvier no. 9), and the following notes will be of interest as proving the point:—

1. Rudolphi (*Beitr. z. Anthrop.* (Berlin), 1812, p. 70) refers to Pars Prima (1811), 568 pp.; Pars Secunda (1812), no pp. These he received after Pallas's death, which occurred on 8th September 1811, and, therefore, he may have received the Pars Secunda later than the Pars Prima. Rudolphi also refers in his *Entoz. Syn.* 1819, pp. 56 and 59, to Pallas, vol. 3, pp. 102 and 409, as "Petrop. 1813".

2. In *Isis* (Oken), 1819, *Litt. Anz.* p. 186, a note says the plates are being engraved under the direction of Tilesius, and the first two volumes are printed off (Mamm. Birds, Reptiles, Fishes).

3. Tilesius, Add. Conch. ad Zoogr. Rosso-Asiat. in *Mém. Ac. Imp. Sci. St. Pétersbourg*, viii. 1817–1818 (1822), read 1st November 1820, p. 293. The opening sentence of this paper leads one to infer that Pallas's work was then accessible. See entry under *Isis* (no. 2).

4. Eversmann (*Reise von Orenburg*, Berlin, 1823) refers on p. 117 to the *Zoographia* as "Petrop. 1811, 3 vols. 4to", and in his text quotes vols. 1, 2, and 3 (up to p. 31).

5. Lichtenstein (*Abh. k. pr. Ak. Wiss.* 1822–23 (1825), p. 6) refers to *Zoogr.* 1, p. 117. In Ersch & Gruber, *Allg. Ency.*, xix, 1829, p. 255, he refers to *Zoogr.* 3, p. 255.

BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

6. Meyendorff (*Voy. d'Orenbourg*, 8°, Paris, 1826, p. 381) says: "Petrop. 1811, 3 vol. in 4to, ouvrage qui n'est pas encore assez connue."

7. Gloger (*N. Acta Ac. Caes.* 13 (2) 1827, p. 484) quotes *Zoogr.* 1, 135 as a rare book.

8. Nitzsch (Ersch & Gruber, *Allg. Ency.* xvi, 1827, p. 152) quotes vol. 2.

9. Cuvier (*Règne Anim.* ed. 2, ii, 1829, p. 163, and iii, 1829, p. 398) says: "Ouvrage que l'on n'a pu rendre public parceque les cuivres en sont égarés. Néanmoins l'Académie de Pétersbourg a bien voulu en accorder le texte à quelques naturalistes". In the *Hist. Poiss.* i. 1828, p. 200, he says: "n'a point encore été publié".

Further, in the *Hist. Poiss.*, Cuvier and Valenciennes in ii, 1828, p. 117, and iv, 1829, p. 152, quote the *Zoogr.* vol. iii, pp. 126 and 246.

10. Eschscholtz (*Zool. Atlas*, iii, 1829) quotes the *Zoogr.* 2, p. 362.

11. In Froriep, *Notizen*, xxviii, 1830, p. 151, there is a notice of vol. 3.

12. In *Rev. Ency.* xlix. March 1831, p. 726, is a note to say that the drawings and plates have been recovered from Leipzig by v. Behr (Baer) and presented to the Academy of St. Petersburg on 18th and 25th October 1830.

The *Zoographia* formed the subject of a paper by von Baer in 1831 (re-issued in 1832) in a thin quarto of 36 pp. published in Königsberg. From this I can only quote some essentials. Baer says:—The text of the Mammals and Birds was sent by Pallas in 1806. Printing began towards the end of 1807 under the eye of Tilesius, and these portions were completely printed just after Pallas's death. The printing of the Fishes was finished in the year 1814. In 1826 the Academy held a commission to put the three volumes on sale: "L'Académie s'est déterminée à le mettre a vente". For all the elaborate details I must refer the reader to this pamphlet.

The *Zoographia* was also the subject of remarks by Strauch in 1873 (*Mém. Ac. Imp. Sci. St. Pétersbourg* (7) xxi, p. 7), who says the Herpetology was all printed by 1811, but plates were delayed for 20 years later. The work appeared in 1831 with new title-pages, and was put into the booksellers' hands.

Seeböhm in 1882 wrote a note to "The Ibis", 1882, p. 425, but Alfred Newton in a letter to me of 7th March 1891, calls it an "extraordinary assertion", and says that Seeböhm in "The Ibis", 1882, p. 611, was satisfied that he had been in error, and declared his former statement to be a "myth". Alfred Newton, who was most learned on the subject, wrote me four letters upon it between 1891 and 1906.

The general delay was caused by Pallas's obstinate determination to have his plates done by Geissler, the Leipzig engraver, as is stated in a note issued by the Academy of St. Petersburg in 1826, p. 16.

From what has been quoted above it is quite clear that vols. 1 and 2 were available to the first zoologists of Europe in 1811 and vol. 3 in 1814, and these are the dates that I adopted in my *Index Animalium* and those which should be accepted.

Some prints from certain missing plates (unpublished) are said to exist in Berlin (where, also, are Pallas's types), as well as in St. Petersburg. The British Museum (Nat. Hist.), Rothschild, Tweeddale, Salvin, and Zoological Society's copies of the work seem to be all alike as to plates.

ON THE STATUS OF THE NAME *CLAVELLARIUS* OLIVIER, 1789 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By H. H. ROSS and B. D. BURKE.

(Illinois State Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)120.)

The vote of the International Zoological Congress, 1935, to place the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, on the *Official List of Generic Names*³ opens up an interesting piece of historical nomenclature. *Cimbex* has been mentioned in controversies only in connection with *Crabro* Geoffroy. The name *Cimbex* for a group of sawflies, however, is antedated not only by *Crabro* Geoffroy but also by *Clavellarius* Olivier. This latter name has been almost completely ignored since its original publication. Briefly, the history of the situation is as follows.

Geoffroy in 1762 proposed the name *Crabro* for the large sawflies now generally known as *Cimbex*. Thirteen years later Fabricius used the name *Crabro* for a group of wasps. At this time authority and not priority was followed, so that the hymenopterists of that time followed the Fabrician usage without question. In 1789 Olivier, in the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, apparently decided that the group of sawflies called *Crabro* by Geoffroy needed a name, yet felt that the name *Crabro* itself should be preserved in its Fabrician sense. Hence he proposed for Geoffroy's group *Crabro* the name *Clavellarius* (: 22) :—

Clavellaire

Clavellarius. *Crabro*, Geoff. *Tenthredo* Lin. Fab.

Antennes en masse, un peu plus courtes que le corcelet.

Quatre antennules filiformes; les deux antérieures un peu plus longues, composées de cinq articles, les deux postérieures de quatre.

In the next volume of the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, 1790, he uses the name *Cimbex* for this group, without any explanation. This appears in the alphabetic part of the *Encyclopédie* and in the next volume, in due course alphabetically, he mentions once more the name *Clavellarius*, indicating that he considered it too close to a name used in botany and hence changed it to *Cimbex*. The passage referred to reads as follows :—

Clavellaire, *Clavellarius*. Ce mot trop ressemblant à celui de *Clavaria*, déjà employé en Botanique, nous ayant paru peu convenable, nous lui avons substitué le mot de *Cimbex*, employé par les Grecs pour désigner des insectes semblables à des Abeilles ou à des Guêpes, & qui paroissent être les mêmes que ceux que nous avons à faire connoître sous ce même nom. Voy, *Cimbex*.

Since *Cimbex* was proposed as a new name for *Clavellarius* the type of one automatically becomes the type of the other. Latreille, 1810, designated the genotype of *Cimbex*, so its type becomes the type of *Clavellarius*. Lamarek in 1801 introduced the spelling *Clavellaria* with a sole included species, *Tenthredo lutea* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 555, but this is not, according to *Opinion* 79 of the International Rules, a type designation.

The synonymy is as follows :—

Crabro Geoffroy, 1762, p. 261. Genotype by subsequent designation of Bradley, 1919, *Crabro humeralis* Fourcroy. Name voted to be set aside by International Zoological Congress, 1935.³

³ See *Opinion* 144 (1943, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 2 : 89-98).

Clavellarius Olivier, 1789, p. 22. Genotype by subsequent designation of Latreille, 1810, *Tenthredo lutea* Linnaeus.

Cimbex Olivier, 1790, p. 762. New name for *Clavellarius*, as explained in Olivier, 1791, p. 18. Genotype by subsequent designation of Latreille, 1810, *Cimbex lutea* (Fabricius) (= *Tenthredo lutea* Linnaeus).

Clavellaria Lamarck, 1801, p. 264. Emendation for *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789.

ON THE RELATIVE STATUS OF THE GENERIC NAMES *CIMBEX* OLIVIER, 1790, AND *CLAVELLARIUS* OLIVIER, 1789 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)120.)

The case of *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790 versus *Crabro* Geoffroy, 1762, was one of thirteen cases dealt with in a memorial signed by sixty hymenopterists, which was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the meeting of the Commission held at Lisbon in September 1935. The object of the petition was to secure a valid nomenclatorial foundation for the commonly accepted use of the generic name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, for *Tenthredo lutea* Linnaeus, 1758, and species congeneric therewith. For this purpose, the petitioners recommended that the name *Crabro* Geoffroy, 1762, should be suppressed by the International Commission under their plenary powers.

2. The memorial containing this case was referred by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature for their observations. The International Committee were due to hold a meeting at Madrid in September 1935 immediately before the meeting of the International Commission at Lisbon and it was arranged, therefore, that the recommendations submitted by the International Committee should be considered by the International Commission at their Lisbon Session.

3. The International Committee at their Madrid meeting agreed to recommend the International Commission to grant the request submitted by the petitioners in the present case. This recommendation was considered and approved by the International Commission at their meeting held at Lisbon on Monday, 16th September 1935 (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 2, for the text of which see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 27-30). This decision was embodied in paragraph 27 of the Report (for the text of which see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 59-60) submitted by the International Commission to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology, by whom it was unanimously approved and adopted at the final plenary session held on Saturday, 21st September 1935 (see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 63).

4. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon by the International Commission at their Lisbon Session (2nd Meeting, Conclusion 9, for the text of which see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 11-12), advertisements relating to

this and other cases involving the suspension of the rules dealt with by the International Commission at Lisbon were published in the prescribed manner in the spring of 1936. As respects the present case no objection of any kind was received by the International Commission in the period of twelve months following the action described above. By 1938, therefore, all the necessary formal action had been taken and the stage had been reached at which an *Opinion* giving effect to the Commission's Lisbon decision could be issued. Owing, first to lack of funds and later to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939, it was not found possible to publish the *Opinion* (*Opinion* 144) dealing with this case until 1943 (*Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 2 : 89-98).

5. The object of the International Commission at Lisbon was to take all necessary steps to validate the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, with *Tenthredo lutea* Linnaeus, 1758, as type. It was only because the Commission had not been apprised of the problem presented by the name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, that they did not suppress that name under their plenary powers at the same time that they suppressed the name *Crabro* Geoffroy, 1762. The present position is that, as the result of the Commission's action at Lisbon (now embodied in *Opinion* 144), the only valid generic name for *Tenthredo lutea* Linnaeus, 1758, is *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, and, therefore, that, although not formally suppressed, the name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, cannot be used as the generic name for that species. This situation is admittedly not satisfactory and it is accordingly proposed to ask the International Commission to put matters on a logical footing by rendering an *Opinion* suppressing the name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, and the emended form *Clavellaria* Lamarck, 1801, under their plenary powers.

6. The fact that from now onwards all such petitions will be published in the Commission's Official Organ, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, before any decisions are taken thereon by the Commission will, it is hoped, prevent difficulties similar to those discussed above from arising in the future.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *BOMBUS* LATREILLE,
1802 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille (1802, *Hist. nat. Fourmis* : 437) founded the monobasic genus *Bombus*, type *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758.

Panzer ([1801], *Faun. Ins. germ.*, 85 : plates 19-21) published the genus *Bremus* and included three species, *Bremus fasciatus* (= *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758), *Bremus agrorum* (= *Apis agrorum* Fabricius, 1787) and *Bremus silvarum* (= *Apis sylvarum* Linnaeus, 1758). Morice and Durrant (1914, *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.* 1914 : 429) fixed the type of *Bremus* as *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus.

Hymenopterists have almost universally employed the generic name *Bombus*, except that since 1914 most American authors have adopted the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine, 1801 (*Intelligenzblatt der Literatur-Zeitung*, Erlangen : 160-165, i.e. the "Erlangen List").

In view of the extensive literature associated with the name *Bombus*, we are of the opinion that the adoption of the name *Bremus* would cause more confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (type *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The name *Bremus* Panzer, 1801 (with the same type) is to be set aside and have no status in nomenclature.^{4, 5}

⁴ The above is an extract from the First Report of the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. At that time that Committee was composed as shown in footnote 20 on p. 189 above. On receiving the Sub-Committee's Report, the Committee on Generic Nomenclature, their Fifth Report, recommended the Council of the Royal Entomological Society of London to transmit the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee's recommendations to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration. This recommendation was approved by the Council of the Society and, on the publication of the Committee's Fifth Report on 14th August 1937, the Sub-Committee's recommendations were forwarded to the International Commission by the Council of the Society.

⁵ Since this petition was submitted, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature have rendered *Opinion* 135 (1939, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 2 : 7-12), in which they have suppressed the "Erlangen List" under their plenary powers. Accordingly, the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine, 1801, referred to in the present petition, no longer has any status in nomenclature and the object desired in the petition can be obtained by the Commission placing the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, without it being necessary for them first to use their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles Internationales*. (int'd.) F.H. 11th August 1944.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR CERATINA LATREILLE,
[1802-1803] (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille ([April 1802]⁶ *Hist. nat. Fourmis*: 432) published the genus *Clavicera* for *Hylaeus albilabris* Fabricius, 1793 = *Apis curcurbitina* Rossi, 1792. The name *Clavicera*, in this sense, has only once been used again, by Walckenaer (July-Sept. 1802).

Latreille ([Oct. 1802-Sept. 1803]⁷ in (Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3: 380), without any explanation, published the genus *Ceratina* to contain the same species. The name *Ceratina* has been universally accepted by hymenopterists and forms the basis of a family (or subfamily) name. In our opinion the substitution of the name *Clavicera* for *Ceratina* would cause far more confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect:—

The name *Ceratina* Latreille, May-July, 1802 (type *Hylaeus albilabris* Fabricius, 1793 = *Apis cucurbitina* Rossi, 1792) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The name *Clavicera* Latreille, April 1802 (with the same type) is therefore to be set aside and to have no status in nomenclature.⁸

⁶ For the date of publication of Latreille's *Hist. nat. Fourmis*, see Griffin in Richards, 1935, *Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83: 174.

⁷ The date of publication of volume 3 of the *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* was discussed by Richards in 1935 (*Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83: 174), where, on the basis of information furnished by F. J. Griffin, he concluded that this volume was published in 1802 on some date between the beginning of May and 21st September, the latter being the last day of the French Revolutionary Year "An X" (which appeared on the title page of vol. 3). Later, this question was further investigated by Griffin, who has shown (1938, *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* 1: 157) that vol. 3 contains a quotation from Walckenaer's *Faune Parisienne*, which is dated "An XI" (i.e., 22 Sept. 1802-21 Sept. 1803) and in consequence that vol. 3 must have been published on some date subsequent to 22nd September 1802 sufficiently late to have enabled Latreille (i) to have received a copy of Walckenaer's *Faune Paris.* and (ii) to have inserted an extract therefrom in the final proof of vol. 3. In these circumstances, it is clear (a) that vol. 3 of the *Hist. nat.* was published after 21st September 1802, (b) that publication can hardly have taken place before some date near the end of October 1802, and (c) that publication may have taken place at any date subsequent thereto but not later than 21st September 1803, the last date of "An XI."

⁸ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *DIODONTUS* CURTIS,
1834 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Curtis (1834, *Brit. Ent.* 11 (124) no. 496 : pl. 496) described a genus *Diodontus* for which he designated as type a species he called "*Psen pallipes* Panzer." He gave *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden, 1829, as a doubtful synonym of his type-species, but it was later discovered that *P. tristis* Van der Linden was the correct name for his species and that he had misidentified Panzer's species (cf. Shuckard, 1837, *Essay Fossor. Hymen.* : 184). All European hymenopterists have treated *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden as the type of *Diodontus* Curtis.

Rohwer (1915) insisted on taking Curtis' statement literally, and therefore made *Psen pallipes* Panzer, 1798, the type of *Diodontus*, and published a new name, *Xylocelia*, for *Diodontus* of authors. At the time that Rohwer was writing, it was thought that *Psen pallipes* Panzer was the same as the species now known as *Trypoxylon atratum* Fabricius, 1805 = *Psenulus atratus* (Fab.). It is now thought (cf. Harttig, 1931, *Stett. ent. Ztg.* 92 : 206) that *Psen pallipes* Panzer is an unrecognisable species of which even the generic position is uncertain. *Diodontus* (in the sense of European authors) is a well-known genus round which a considerable bionomic and zoo-geographical literature has grown up. The substitution of another generic name for *Diodontus* would cause more confusion than uniformity.

We are therefore of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The genus *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834, with type *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden, 1829, is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The fact that Curtis in his original description of his genus erroneously referred to the type-species as *Psen pallipes* Panzer is not to be regarded as fixing the latter species as the type of *Diodontus*.⁹

⁹ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR THE NAMES *FORMICA* LINNAEUS, 1758, AND *CAMPONOTUS* MAYR, 1861 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Linnaeus (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10a) 1: 579) founded the genus *Formica* for a number of species of ants, including *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758. Latreille (1810, *Consid. génér.*: 437) cited the latter species as the type of the genus. This citation is valid although the name *Formica herculeana* is followed by the words "ejusdem rufa," indicating that *Formica rufa* was also a member of the genus. Curtis (1839, *Brit. Ent.* 16: plate 752) designated *Formica rufa* as the type and his designation has been universally followed by hymenopterists. Meanwhile, *Formica herculeana* is now placed in the genus *Camponotus* Mayr (1861, *Europ. Formicid.*: 35) (type *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802, by designation of Bingham, 1903, *Faun. Brit. India*, Hym. 2: 347).

Camponotus and *Formica* in the generally accepted sense are both very large genera of world-wide distribution and any change in their generic nomenclature would cause great confusion.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect:—

The names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (type *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758) and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (type *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The designation by Latreille (1810) of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Formica* is therefore to be set aside and the designation by Curtis (1839) of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, is to be upheld.^{10, 11}

¹⁰ See footnote 4 above.

¹¹ *Supplementary Note by the Secretary to the International Commission*: In view of the clarification of the Commission's *Opinion* 11 given in *Opinion* 136 (which was not published at the time when the present application was drawn up), the difficulties in regard to *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, discussed in that application have disappeared, for under *Opinion* 136 Latreille did not in 1810 make a valid designation of the type of *Formica* Linnaeus. In consequence the designation by Curtis (1839) of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of that genus is valid. Thus, the names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, can now be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, without the prior use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles Internationales*. (int'd.) F.H. 11th August 1944.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR GORYTES LATREILLE, 1804, AND HOPLISUS LEPELETIER, 1832 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille (March 1804, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 24 : 180) described a genus *Gorytes*, citing only a single species, *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793, which is therefore the type.

Latreille ([Sept. 1804], in (Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 13 : 308) published another description of *Gorytes*, including this time the species *Sphex mystacea* Linnaeus, 1761. Latreille (1810, *Consid. génér.* : 438) fixed *Sphex mystacea* Linnaeus, 1761, as the type of the genus, an action in which he has been followed by nearly all hymenopterists.

Lepeletier (1832, *Ann. Soc. ent. France* 1 : 61) founded a genus *Hoplisus* (type *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793, by designation of Westwood, 1839). The name *Hoplisus* has been universally used as a generic or sub-generic name for the species allied to *Mellinus quinquecinctus*. In our opinion the transference of the name *Gorytes* to the cosmopolitan group now known as *Hoplisus* and the erection of a new name for the group now known as *Gorytes* would cause greater confusion in nomenclature than would a suspension of the rules in the sense indicated above.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The names *Gorytes* Latreille, Sept. 1804 (type *Sphex mystacea* Linnaeus, 1761), and *Hoplisus* Lepeletier, 1832 (type *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The description of *Gorytes* by Latreille (March 1804, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 24 : 180), with type *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793, is therefore to be set aside and to have no status in nomenclature.^{12, 13}

¹² See footnote 4 above.

¹³ *Supplementary Note by Dr. O. W. Richards* : This case has been discussed by V. S. L. Pate in "The generic names of the Sphecoid wasps and their type species" (1937, *Mem. Amer. ent. Soc.* 9 : 103), where he holds that *Hoplisus* Lepeletier, 1832, is antedated by *Euzonia* Kirby in Stephens, 1829, *Syst. Cat. Brit. Ins.* : 363, with type *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793, by designation of Pate, *loc. cit.* I still put forward the proposal of maintaining the names *Gorytes* Latreille, 1804, and *Hoplisus* Lepeletier, 1832.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *HARPACTUS* SHUCKARD,
1837 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum Natural History),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Panzer (1806, *Krit. Rev.* 2: 164) and Jurine (1807, *Nouv. Meth. Class. Hym.*) founded a genus *Arpactus* including amongst other species *Arpactus campestris* Panzer = *Sphex mystacea* Linnaeus, 1761, which Morice and Durrant (1914, *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.* 1914: 403) fixed as the type.

Arpactus is thus a synonym of *Gorytes* Latreille, 1804, having the same type. Shuckard (1837, *Fossorial Hymen.*: 220) cited *Arpactus formosus* Jurine, 1807 = *Mutilla laevis* Latreille, 1792 as type of *Arpactus* Jurine, 1807. At the same time he pointed out that on etymological grounds the generic name should be spelled *Harpactus*. *Harpactus* has since almost universally been used in Shuckard's sense.

Arpactus Jurine, 1807, is invalid, being antedated by *Arpactus* Panzer, 1806. The emended form *Harpactus* is therefore also invalid, but in view of the very general acceptance of the name in its emended form, the introduction of a new generic name for *A. formosus* Jurine would clearly lead to greater confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect:—

Shuckard (1837, *Fossorial Hymen.*: 220) shall be deemed to have published a new generic name *Harpactus* and to have specified *Arpactus formosus* Jurine, 1807 (= *Mutilla laevis* Latreille, 1792) as its type. The generic name *Harpactus* Shuckard, 1837, as defined in this *Opinion*, is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*.^{14 15, 16}

¹⁴ Note by the Secretary to the International Commission: Dr. O. W. Richards has drawn my attention (*in litt.*) to the view put forward by V. S. L. Pate (1937, *Mem. Amer. ent. Soc.* 9) that, contrary to the statement in the present application, Morice and Durrant (1914, *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.* 1914: 403) did not make a valid type designation for the genus *Arpactus* Panzer, 1806. After examining the passage in question, I agree with the view expressed by Pate. (int'd.) F.H. 15th December 1945.

¹⁵ See footnote 4 above.

¹⁶ Supplementary Note by Dr. O. W. Richards: According to V. S. L. Pate 1937, "The generic names of the Sphecoid wasps and their type species (Hymenoptera: Aculeata)" (*Mem. Amer. ent. Soc.* 9: 10):—

Arpactus Panzer, 1805, *Faun. Ins. germ.* 98: no. 17, has type *Mellinus 4-fasciatus* Fabricius, [1805]. Monobasic.

Arpactus Panzer, 1806, *Krit. Rev. Insektenf. Deutschl.* 2: 164, has type *Mellinus 4-fasciatus* Fabricius, [1805], by designation of Pate, 1937, *loc. cit.*: 11.

The type of *Arpactus* Panzer is congeneric with that of *Hoplissus* Lepeletier, 1832.

I would suggest putting *Gorytes* Latreille, 1804, *Hoplissus* Lepeletier, 1832, and *I. arpactus* Shuckard, 1837, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with the types which I have already proposed. *Arpactus* Panzer, although earlier than *Hoplissus* Lepeletier, would then become a synonym.

BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR MACROPIS (KLUG MS.)
PANZER, [1806-1809], AND MEGILLA FABRICIUS, [1804-1805] (CLASS
INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London);

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Klug (*in* Panzer, [1806-1809], *Faun. Ins. germ.* 109 : fig. 16) founded the genus *Macropis* on the single species *Megilla labiata* Fabricius, [1804-1805]. *Macropis* is a very distinct genus round which a considerable bionomic and zoogeographical literature has grown up.

Fabricius ([1804-1805], *Syst. Piez.* : 328), however, founded a composite genus *Megilla* of which Westwood (1840, *Introd. Mod. Class. Ins.* 2 : synopsis, 158) fixed the type as *M. labiata* Fabricius, [1804-1805], thus making *Macropis* Klug a synonym of *Megilla* Fab.

Richards (1935, *Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83 : 172), overlooking Westwood's type-fixation, chose *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type, thus making *Megilla* Fabricius a synonym of *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803.¹⁷

In our opinion the substitution of the name *Megilla* for *Macropis* would cause far more confusion than uniformity.

The easiest way of getting over this difficulty would be for the International Commission to set aside Westwood's designation of *Megilla labiata* Fab. as the type of *Megilla* Fab., since Richards' action in 1935 would thus become valid, and *Megilla* Fab. would sink as a synonym as explained above.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Macropis* Klug *in* Panzer, [1806-1809] (type *Megilla labiata* Fabricius, [1804-1805]) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The type of *Megilla* Fabricius, [1804-1805] (*Syst. Piez.* : 328) shall be deemed to be *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 579), notwithstanding the action of Westwood (1840, *Introd. mod. Class. Ins.* 2 : synopsis, 158) in designating *Megilla labiata* Fabricius as the type of that genus.¹⁸

¹⁷ See *Opinion* 151 in 1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 2 : 169-180.

¹⁸ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR MEGACHILE
LATREILLE, 1802 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille (1802, *Hist. nat. Fourmis* : 434) published the genus *Megachile*, including a number of species. Latreille (1810, *Consid. génér.* : 439) fixed the type as *Apis muraria* Retzius, 1783, though the name of the type-species was followed by certain other names (including *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758), prefixed by the word "*ejusdem*."

Curtis (1828, *Brit. Ent.* 5 : plate 218) designated *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Megachile*.

Lepeletier (1841, *Hist. nat. Ins. Hymén.* 2 : 309) described a genus *Chalicodoma* of which the type was fixed by Girard (1879, *Traité d'Ent.* 2 : 778) as *Apis muraria* Retzius, 1783.*

Hymenopterists have almost universally used the generic name *Chalicodoma* for *Apis muraria* and its allies and *Megachile* for *Apis centuncularis* and its allies. A large literature, both taxonomic and bionomic, has grown up round this usage. The two groups are generically distinct, or, at least, form very distinct subgenera. In our opinion the transference of the name *Megachile* to the group of which *Apis muraria* Retzius, 1783, is the type would cause far more confusion than uniformity. If the type-fixation of Latreille (1810) were set aside and that of Curtis (1828) upheld, this difficulty would be avoided.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (type *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The designation by Latreille (1810, *Consid. génér.* : 439) of *Apis muraria* Retzius, 1783,* as the type is, therefore, to be set aside and the designation by Curtis (1828, *Brit. Ent.* 5 : plate 218) of *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, is to be upheld.^{19, 20}

* There appears to be some doubt as to the real identity of the bee described by Retzius as *Apis muraria*. Until this question is settled, it is suggested that the bee referred to above be regarded as *Chalicodoma muraria* Lepeletier (1841, *Hist. nat. Ins. Hym.* 2 : 309). The position of the genera *Megachile* and *Chalicodoma* is not affected by the name ultimately shown to be the right one for *C. muraria*.

¹⁹ See footnote 4 above.

²⁰ *Supplementary Note by the Secretary to the International Commission* : The case of *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, is exactly parallel to that of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, discussed in footnote 11 above, for the difficulties apprehended by the applicants have been completely eliminated by the publication of the Commission's *Opinion* 136, clarifying *Opinion* 11, as it is now seen that Latreille in 1810 (*Consid. gén.*) did not make a valid designation of the type of *Megachile* Latreille. In consequence, the designation by Curtis (1828) of *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of this genus is valid and the currently accepted usage is correct. Thus, the name *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, can now be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, without the prior use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles Internationales*. (int'd) F.H. 11th August 1944.

BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *METHOCA* LATREILLE,
1804 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille (March 1804, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 24 : 179) published a genus *Methocha* for the single species *Mutilla articulata* Latreille, 1792. Latreille ([Sept. 1804–Sept. 1805], (in Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 13 : 268) included two species, *Mutilla articulata* Latreille, 1792 and *Mutilla formicaria* Latreille, 1792. The name of the second species is pre-occupied by *Mutilla formicaria* Linnaeus, 1758. The name *Mutilla articulata*, Latreille changed to *Methoca ichneumonides*, without giving any reasons for the change. There is only a single European species of *Methoca* and there is no certainty as to the identity of *Mutilla formicaria* of Latreille, 1802.

The emended spelling *Methoca* and the trivial name *ichneumonides* have been universally accepted by hymenopterists. On the former has been founded the family name METHOCIDAE, while round the latter a large bionomic literature has accumulated. The use of the spelling *Methocha* and of the trivial name *articulata* or the erection of a new generic name for "*Methoca*" in its modern sense would cause far more confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Methoca* Latreille, March, 1804 (emend. Latreille, Sept. 1804) (type *Methoca ichneumonides* Latreille, Sept. 1804) is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The spelling *Methocha* Latreille, March 1804 and the trivial name *articulata* (Latreille, 1792) are therefore not to be substituted for *Methoca* and *ichneumonides*, respectively.²¹

²¹ See footnote 4 above.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR NOTOZUS FÖRSTER,
1853 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

We are of the opinion that it is highly undesirable to replace *Notozus* Förster, 1853, by *Elampus* Spinola, 1806. The former generic name (type *Hedychrum spina* Lepeletier, 1806, fixed by Ashmead, 1902, *Canad. Ent.* **34**: 228) has been in constant use for the last thirty years. During a very much longer period *Elampus* Spinola (in Agassiz' emendation *Ellampus*) has been widely used for the group of species more recently placed in *Omalus* Panzer, 1801. The use of the name *Elampus* for the species now placed in *Notozus* would cause greater confusion than uniformity. Latreille (1810, *Consid. génér.*: 437), however, fixed the type of *Elampus* as *Chrysis panzeri* Fabricius, 1805.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect:—

The name *Notozus* Förster, 1853 (type *Hedychrum spina* Lepeletier, 1806) is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The name *Elampus* Spinola, 1806 (with the same type) is therefore not to be substituted for it.²²

²² See footnote 4 above.

**PROPOSED EMENDATION TO NYSSON OF THE NAME NYSSO
LATREILLE, 1796 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

Ö. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille (1796, *Préc. Car. génér. Ins.* : 125) published the genus *Nysson* without included species. Later, [Oct. 1802–Sept. 1803],²³ (in Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3 : 340), Latreille emended the name to *Nysson* and included two species. In 1810 (*Consid. génér.* : 438), he fixed one of these species, viz. *Mellinus tricinctus* Fabricius, 1775 = *Sphex spinosa* Forster, 1771, as the type. The emended spelling has universally been used by hymenopterists and the family (or subfamily) name NYSSONIDAE has been founded on it.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Nysson* Latreille, 1802 (type *Sphex spinosa* Forster, 1771) is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The name *Nysson* Latreille, 1796, is not to be substituted for it.²⁴

²³ For the date here assigned to this volume, see footnote 7 above.

²⁴ See footnote 4 above.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR ODYNERUS LATREILLE,
[1802-1803] (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille ([1802-1803] ²⁵ in (Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3 : 362) founded the genus *Odynerus* for two supposed species, *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758, and for what he termed "*Vespa muraria* Linnaeus". Latreille ([1804-1805], in (Sonnini's Buffon) *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 13 : 347) states that his so-called *Vespa muraria* is the same as the species whose habits are described in detail by Réaumur (1742, *Mém. serv. Hist. Ins.* 6 : 285, pl. 26). Shuckard (1837, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* 1 : 493) and Saussure (1852, *Monogr. Guepes solit.* 1 : 233) show that Réaumur's species was really *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus. Thus *Odynerus* was effectively monobasic. Bequaert, the foremost living authority on the VESPIDAE, accepts *Vespa spinipes* as the type of *Odynerus* (e.g. 1919, *Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* 39 : 290). Nevertheless, Westwood (1840, *Introd. mod. Class. Ins.* 2 Synopsis : 83) cited *Vespa muraria* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Odynerus*. Westwood's action might be regarded as fixing the type, if Latreille's words (and not his meaning) are rigidly construed.

Since Bequaert's works are now the basis of most taxonomic studies in the VESPIDAE, it is very undesirable that his treatment of *Odynerus* should be upset (*Vespa muraria* Linnaeus, 1758, not being congeneric with *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758). Such a change in the type of *Odynerus* would tend to cause more confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The genus *Odynerus* Latreille, [1802-1803], with type *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The citation by Latreille, 1802, of *Vespa muraria* Linnaeus, 1758, as an original member of *Odynerus* was due to a mis-identification and his *Vespa muraria* was in reality the same as *Vespa spinipes*. Westwood's action, therefore, in citing *Vespa muraria* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Odynerus* is not to be treated as a valid type-fixation.²⁶

²⁵ For the date here assigned to this volume, see footnote 7 above.

²⁶ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *PONERA* LATREILLE,
1804 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Latreille (March 1804, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 24 : 179) described the genus *Ponera* for his "Fourmis étranglées." This group was defined in 1802, *Hist. nat. Fourmis*, where it included, amongst other species, *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802, and *Formica crassinoda* Latreille, 1802. Latreille (1810, *Consid. génér.* : 437) cited *Formica crassinoda* as the type. Westwood (1840, *Introd. mod. Class. Ins.* 2 : synopsis 83) cited *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802, as the type.

In 1858 (*Cat. Hym. Brit. Mus.* 6 : 105), F. Smith erected the genus *Pachycondyla* for the species with which *Formica crassinoda* Latreille, 1802, is congeneric. The names *Ponera* Latreille (in the sense of Westwood) and *Pachycondyla* Smith have been universally accepted by hymenopterists and a large bionomic literature has grown up round the former name. Any modification of this practice would cause far greater confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Ponera* Latreille, March, 1804 (type *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802 = *Formica coarctata* Latreille, 1801) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The designation of *Formica crassinoda* Latreille, 1802, as type of *Ponera* by Latreille (1810) is therefore to be set aside and the designation of *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802, by Westwood (1840) to be accepted.²⁷

²⁷ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR RHOPALUM (KIRBY MS.) STEPHENS, 1829 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Stephens (1829, *Nomencl. Brit. Ins.* : 34) described a genus *Rhopalum* and Curtis (1837, *Brit. Ent.* **14** : pl. 656) fixed the type as *Crabro rufiventris* Panzer, 1799 = *Sphex clavipes* Linnaeus, 1758. Pate (1935, *Ent. News* **46** : 246) has recently discovered that Risso described a genus *Euplilis* in 1826 (*Hist. nat. Europ. merid.* **5** : 227) and he has fixed *Crabro rufiventris* Panzer, 1799, as the type. Risso's genus has apparently not otherwise been noticed since its original publication, whereas *Rhopalum* is a well-known genus on which a subfamily name has been based. In our opinion the resurrection of the name *Euplilis* and the sinking of the name *Rhopalum* would cause more confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 (type *Crabro rufiventris* Panzer, 1799 = *Sphex clavipes* Linnaeus, 1758) be added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The name *Euplilis* Risso, 1826, with the same type is therefore to be set aside and to have no status in nomenclature.²⁸

²⁸ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR SOLENIUS LEPELETIER
AND BRULLÉ, 1835 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)133.)

Lepeletier and Brullé (1835, *Ann. Soc. ent. France* 3 : 713) founded a genus *Solenius* for a number of species including one which they termed "*Solenius vagus*." In the synonymy of this species they placed *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus and *Crabro vagus* of Fabricius, Panzer, etc. They cited no genotype. Westwood (1839, *Introd. mod. Class. Ins.* 2 Synopsis : 80) cited "*Sphex vaga* Linn. Pz. 46.10" as the type.

From Lepeletier and Brullé's description of their *Solenius vagus* it is clear that they had before them the well-known Crabronid *Solenius continuus* (Fabricius, 1805) and not the true *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus, 1758 (= *Mellinus arvensis* (Linnaeus, 1758)) [see Richards, 1935]. Therefore, either (a) Westwood was citing as the type a species not originally included, or (b) he was referring to *Sphex vaga* in the sense of authors, not of Linnaeus. His reference to Panzer (1797, *Faun. Ins. germ.* 46 : 10) makes it clear that alternative (b) is the correct one.

The genus *Solenius* (including species congeneric with *S. continuus* (Fab.)) has an important bionomic literature attached to it, and it has been made the basis of a subfamily name (SOLENIINAE) by some authors. The substitution of another name for *Solenius* would, in our opinion, cause more confusion than uniformity.

We are therefore of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The genus *Solenius* Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835, with type *Solenius continuus* (Fabricius, 1805) is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The fact that they referred to this species as *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus, 1758, and that Westwood (1839) cited the same species as the genotype is not to be taken as fixing the true *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus as the type, since there is good evidence that they had misidentified Linnaeus' species.²⁹

²⁹ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES TO PRESERVE THE TRIVIAL COMPONENT (ARVENSIS) OF THE SPECIFIC NAME VESPA ARVENSIS LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)134.)

Vespa arvensis Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 573

versus

Sphex vaga Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* (ed. 10) 1 : 571

In the *Systema Naturae* (ed. 10) 1, Linnaeus described a *Vespa arvensis* and a *Sphex vaga*. Richards (1935, *Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83 : 169) has recently examined the types of these species and has shown that they are the female and male respectively of the species commonly known as *Mellinus arvensis* (L.) (SPHECIDAE, subfamily MELLININAE). Hitherto *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus has been used as the name of a common species of *Solenius* (SPHECIDAE, subfamily CRABRONINAE). Under the name of *Crabro vagus* or *Solenius vagus* a large literature has grown up around this species, which must in future be known as *Solenius continuus* (Fabricius, 1805).

In our opinion to replace the trivial name *arvensis* by the trivial name *vagus* would cause more confusion than uniformity and would, in particular, render a large bionomic literature much more difficult of access.

We are of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The Law of Priority be suspended in the case of *Sphex vagus* Linnaeus (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 571), the use of the name *Vespa arvensis* Linnaeus (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 573) being allowed to continue in use for the species commonly known as *Mellinus arvensis* (Linnaeus).³⁰

³⁰ See footnote 4 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES TO PRESERVE THE TRIVIAL COMPONENT (*AGRORUM*) OF THE SPECIFIC NAME *APIS AGRORUM* FABRICIUS. 1787 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

CH. FERRIÈRE

(Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

and

O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.

(Imperial College of Science and Technology, London).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)135.)

Apis agrorum Fabricius, 1787, *Mant. Insect.* 1 : 301

versus

Apis agrorum Schrank, 1781, *Enum. Insect. Austr.* : 397

Fabricius (1787, *Mant. Insect.* 1 : 301) described as *Apis agrorum* a species which is common over the whole of Europe and Western Asia.

The trivial name has been used as the basis of a subgenus, *Agrobombus* Vogt, 1911. There is a very large literature, both bionomic and zoo-geographical, associated with the name *B. agrorum* (Fabricius).

Unfortunately Schrank (1781, *Enum. Insect. Austr.* : 397) had already described an *Apis agrorum*, antedating Fabricius' species by six years. Schrank's species is also a *Bombus*, but cannot certainly be recognised as to species; it may be the species now known as *Bombus distinguendus* Morawitz, 1869.

In our opinion, the replacement of the name *Bombus agrorum* (Fabricius, 1787) by any other name would cause more confusion than uniformity.

We are of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The Law of Priority be suspended in the case of *Apis agrorum* Schrank (1781, *Enum. Insect. Austr.* : 397), the use of the name *Apis agrorum* Fabricius (1787, *Mant. Insect.* 1 : 301) being allowed to continue for the species commonly known as *Bombus agrorum* (Fabricius) (e.g. as defined by Saunders, 1896, *Hym. Acul. Brit. Islands* : 367).³¹

³¹ See footnote 4 above.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR THE GENOTYPE
OF *ERYCINA* LAMARCK, 1805 (CLASS PELECYPODA, ORDER
HETERODONTA)**

By HARALD A. REHDER.

(Associate Curator, Division of Mollusks, Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)69.)

In 1805, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* 6 (36) : 413, Lamarck proposed the genus *Erycina* for a heterogeneous assemblage of six species, all fossils of the Paris basin.

In 1807 Froriep (*Lamarck's Neues System der Conchylien*, Weimar : 38) mentioned *Erycina laevis* Lamarck, 1805, *loc. cit.* 6 (36) : 414 (the first of the six species cited by Lamarck) as an example of the genus. This is not a type designation, although Dall apparently so considered it (1900, *Trans. Wagner Free Inst. Sci.* 3 (5) : 1141 footnote).

In 1823, Children (*Quart. J. Sci.* 14 : 299) selected *Erycina cardioides* Lamarck, 1818, *Hist. nat. Anim. sans Vert.* 5 : 486, as the type, but this choice cannot be accepted, as that species was not one of the six species included in the original description of *Erycina* Lamarck.

In 1844 Recluz (*Rev. zool.* 7 : 291-299, 325-336) monographed the genus *Erycina* Lamarck, having been able, as he states, to examine Lamarck's types. Of the six original species he considered *Erycina fragilis* Lamarck, 1805, *loc. cit.* 6 (36) : 415 and *Erycina elliptica* Lamarck, 1805, *loc. cit.* 6 (36) : 415 to belong to *Diplodonta* Bronn, 1831, *Ergeb. nat. Reisen* 2 : 484; *Erycina inaequilatera* Lamarck, 1805, *loc. cit.* 6 (36) : 415, *Erycina laevis* Lamarck, 1805, to be members of *Tellina* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 674, restricting *Erycina* Lamarck to the single species *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* 7 (37) : 53; *Erycina trigona* Lamarck, 1805, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* 6 (36) : 414 he did not mention, probably because it was a single valve in poor condition.

Deshayes, 1858 (*Description des Animaux sans Vert. dec. dans le Bassin de Paris* 1 : 700-704), agreed in general with Recluz, making, however, *Erycina fragilis* Lamarck the type of the new genus *Psathura* Deshayes, 1858, *loc. cit.* 1 : 478, and doubtfully identifying *Erycina trigona* Lamarck as the valve of a species of *Corbulomya* Nyst, [1844], *Mém. cour. Acad. roy. Belgique* 17 : 59.

This has been, on the whole, the view of all subsequent workers. Following this viewpoint, Stoliczka in 1870 (*Cretaceous Fauna of Southern India* 3 (Pelecypoda) : xix) designated *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck as type, which has to the present been generally accepted.

Of course, it may logically be considered that Recluz in 1844 designated *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck as type by restriction, making *Erycina* Lamarck monotypic (see *Opinion* 6).³² However, five years before Recluz's careful study,

³² *Opinion* 6 does not provide for the restriction of a genus containing three or more species, such as *Erycina* Lamarck; but is expressly confined to the case of a genus "A—", established with two species only, where one of the two originally included species is subsequently made the type of a monotypical genus. For the text of *Opinion* 6, with notes thereon, see 1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 1 : 127-138.

appeared Anton's Catalogue of his collection (1839, *Verzeichniss der Conchylien welche sich in der Sammlung von H. E. Anton befinden*), which contains valid type designations for all the genera and subgenera mentioned. Here, on page 6, he designates *Erycina elliptica* Lamarck as type, the species which Recluz and Deshayes had placed in the genus *Diplodonta* Bronn, 1831 (now known by the name *Taras* Risso, 1826, *Hist. nat. Europe* 4: 344).

The acceptance of Anton's type designation would mean (i) that the name *Erycina* Lamarck would be used for the group long known as *Diplodonta* Bronn and *Taras* Risso and (ii) that the genus *Erycina* of authors would need a new name. This transposition would cause endless confusion, especially as both groups are common as Tertiary fossils and used as index fossils in stratigraphy.

In view of this, it is advisable that the International Commission stabilise the status of *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805, under suspension of the rules, by placing *Erycina* Lamarck on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, as type.

PROPOSAL THAT GESNER (J.), 1758, *TRACTATUS PHYSICUS DE PETRIFICATIS*, SHOULD BE SUPPRESSED FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES

By J. BROOKES KNIGHT.

(Department of Geology, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)146.)

I wish to have an *Opinion* from the International Commission on the status of the names of Gesner (J.), 1758, *Tractatus physicus de Petrificatis* . . .

Gesner apparently names and describes (in Latin) genera, without referring species to them. Later authors have used the same generic names, usually without any statement as to the authorship of the names, and have included species in them. However, since about 1830 most of these names, all ending in "-ites", have gone out of fashion. Such as are still used are attributed to authors subsequent to Gesner. A few authors have noted Gesner's names and have rejected them out of hand as not being binominal. As a rule, they are overlooked. Sherborn accepted Gesner's names as available.

If the International Commission should decide that Gesner's generic names are technically available, it is suggested that the whole work be made unavailable under suspension of the rules, on the grounds that the adoption, as from 1758, of the names that appear in Gesner's *Tractatus physicus* would cause considerable confusion in various fields of taxonomy. Nothing would be gained by retaining them as available, save priority of the most sterile sort. Such of the names as are taken up by later authors (with, or without, reference to Gesner) should be considered valid or not on the merits of such later usage and should date from such usage, without jeopardy of homonymy with Gesner's names.

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER *LIODES* HEYDEN, 1826 (CLASS ARACHNIDA, ORDER ACARINA) IS A HOMONYM OF *LEIODES* LATREILLE, 1796 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By the late ARTHUR P. JACOT.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)64.)

Is the genus *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, *Isis* (Oken) 1826 : 611 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) a homonym of *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796, *Précis Caract. Ins.* : 22 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) ?

The whole question is whether the two words are different enough both to be available as generic names. In America some beetle specialists spell Latreille's name *Leiodes* in the emended form *Liodes*, as proposed by Erichson, 1845, *Deutschl. Ins.* (Col. 1) 3 : 87, thus engendering confusion.

As a specialist in mites, I should like to know whether the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, is available for the mite genus. It has been in use, was subsequently abandoned, and now an acarologist is reviving it. Is it technically available ?

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER THE NAMES *LIODES* HEYDEN, 1826 (CLASS ARACHNIDA, ORDER ACARINA) AND *LEIODES* LATREILLE, 1796 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA) ARE OF THE SAME ORIGIN AND MEANING

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)64.)

In *Opinion* 147,³³ published on 30th September 1943, the International Commission set out certain decisions which they had taken at Lisbon in 1935 (Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 14),³⁴ regarding the principles to be observed in interpreting Article 34 of the International Code in relation to the rejection, as homonyms, of generic and subgeneric names of the same origin and meaning as names previously published.

Under the decision embodied in *Opinion* 147, "a generic name of the same origin and meaning as a previously published generic name is to be rejected as a homonym of the said name if it is distinguished therefrom only by . . . the use of "*ei*", "*i*", and "*y*". . . .

In the case submitted to the Commission by the late Dr. Jacot, the point which requires to be determined is whether the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) is of the same origin and meaning as the prior name *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). If the examination of the origin and meaning of these two generic names were to show that, in accordance with the provisions of Article 19, the name *Leiodes*

³³ See 1943, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 2 : 123-132.

³⁴ See 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 39-40.

BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

Latreille, 1796, should be emended to *Liodes* (as proposed by Erichson, 1845), then the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, would fall as a homonym of *Liodes* (emendation of *Leiodes*) Latreille, 1796. If, however, the examination of the origin and meaning of these names were to establish that, although there was no case for emending *Leiodes* Latreille to *Liodes*, the names *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796, and *Liodes*, 1826, were of the same origin and meaning, then, under *Opinion* 147, *Liodes* Heyden would fall as a homonym of *Leiodes* Latreille. If, however, the examination of these names either (i) failed to establish that these names were of the same origin and meaning or (ii) definitely established that they were not, then the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, would not be invalidated by *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796, and would, therefore, be an available name.

In order, therefore, to assist the International Commission in reaching a conclusion on the case submitted by Dr. Jacot, specialists commenting on that case are particularly asked to address themselves to the questions indicated above.

(continued from front wrapper)

- On the status of the name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By H. H. Ross and B. D. Burke, *Illinois State Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois* p. 201
- On the relative status of the generic names *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, and *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* p. 202
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)*, Ch. Ferrière, *Imperial Institute of Entomology, London*, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc., *Imperial College of Science and Technology, London* p. 204
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Ceratina* Latreille, [1802-1803] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 205
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 206
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for the names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 207
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Gorytes* Latreille, 1804, and *Hoplisus* Lepeletier, 1832 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 208
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Harpactus* Shuckard, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 209
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Macropis* (Klug MS.) Panzer, [1806-1809], and *Megilla* Fabricius, [1804-1805] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 210
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 211
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Methoca* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 212
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Notozus* Förster, 1853 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 213
- Proposed emendation to *Nysson* of the name *Nysson* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 214
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Odynerus* Latreille, [1802-1803] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 215
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Ponera* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 216
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Rhopalum* (Kirby MS.) Stephens, 1829 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 217
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Solenius* Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 218

- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* to preserve the trivial component (*arvensis*) of the specific name *Vespa arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), Ch. Ferrière, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc., Imperial College of Science and Technology, London p. 219
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* to preserve the trivial component (*agrorum*) of the specific name *Apis agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A., Ch. Ferrière, and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. p. 220
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for the genotype of *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta). By Harald Rehder, Associate Curator, Division of Mollusks, Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C. p. 221
- Proposal that Gesner (J.), 1758, *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis*, should be suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes. By J. Brookes Knight, Department of Geology, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. p. 222
- On the question whether *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) is a homonym of *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By the late Arthur P. Jacot p. 223
- On the question whether the names *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) and *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) are of the same origin and meaning. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature p. 223

OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The above work, which is obtainable from the Publications Office of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the corporation formed for managing the financial affairs of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) at its Publications Office, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7, is being published in three volumes concurrently, as follows :—

- VOLUME 1. Parts 1–25 (containing *Declarations* 1–9 and re-issues of *Opinions* 1–16) have now been published. When complete, this volume will contain all the pre-Lisbon *Opinions*.
VOLUME 2, Section A. This Section is now complete in 31 Parts ((Parts 1–30, 30 A) and contains the first instalment of the Lisbon decisions embodied in *Declarations* 10–12 and *Opinions* 134–160.
VOLUME 2, Section B. This Section will contain the remainder of the *Opinions* adopted at Lisbon (*Opinions* 161–181). Parts 31–51, containing *Opinions* 161–181, have now been published. Part 52 containing the index and title page is in the press.
VOLUME 3. Parts 1–11 (containing *Opinions* 182–192) have now been published. The *Opinions* published in this volume are those which have been adopted by the International Commission since their Lisbon Session.

Additional Parts of all the above volumes are in the press and will be published as soon as possible.